

Steelhead Recovery Team Meeting

August 28, 2014 Meeting Summary

10:00 am – 12:00 pm, teleconference

v. 9-2-14

Decisions & Actions from the Meeting

Decision	Comments
1. Agreed to move forward with the life cycle model approach (including soliciting a post-doctoral student).	
2. Agreed to consider the hybrid model approach at the September Recovery Team meeting.	With work from Recovery Goals & Scenarios subgroup

Action	Assignment
1. Consider the hybrid approach (life cycle with EDT model) at the September Recovery Team meeting.	Recovery Goals & Scenarios subgroup
2. Begin soliciting a post-doctoral student to begin the life cycle model approach (work to get him/her under contract prior to September 30, 2014).	Recovery Goals & Scenarios subgroup
3. Follow up with next steps for the September meeting.	Elizabeth Babcock & Alison Agness

Welcome & Introductions

Elizabeth Babcock welcomed the Recovery Team to the fourth meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to identify the goals and get agreement on the next steps for adopting a modeling approach. NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service acquired funds that can allow for the Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife (WDFW) staff to do work on the background paper used today.

Recovery Goals & Scenarios Paper/Proposal

Joe Anderson walked through the draft document that the Recovery Goals & Scenarios subgroup prepared for the Recovery Team. Points from the discussion included:

- The actions anticipated out of the modeling approach include habitat protection & restoration, both a general suite of actions but also more specific watershed-scale protection and restoration actions.
- The Recovery Team discussed that they have not yet determined whether they will do a Puget Sound-wide study of steelhead and then translate that to the watershed scale, or vice versa.
 - The chinook recovery planning process included multiple modeling approaches, which allowed comparisons of outcomes from each of the modeling approaches. Doing two modeling approaches for steelhead is possible, but the amount of funding could limit the scope of work.

- The modeling approach will include regional and population scales, and can be set up to incorporate both aspects.
- One Recovery Team member noted that the modeling should be focused on developing actionable steps for recovery, not to do science for the sake of doing science.
- The comparison table of modeling approaches included the following points:
 - The life cycle model would give information about habitat protection and marine survival. They could develop a series of scenarios about what would happen in freshwater and marine environments. Each unique combination in freshwater and marine would develop a long-term projection, which could be translated to the regional level if desired.
 - The models could generate data to inform the role of populations within a major population group (MPG). Each population's predictions would be dependent upon landscape-level production.
 - The EDT model is proprietary, and the life cycle model is not. This means that the co-managers could continue to use the life cycle model, whereas it would be an ongoing cost for the EDT model.
 - The EDT model would give an estimate of abundance at a given time period in the future, whereas the life cycle and landscape models show the trajectory over time.
 - The life cycle model would take time to get up and running, whereas the EDT model could be ready to use more quickly. The EDT model has relationships built into it when data are not available, whereas the life cycle model needs all the data to be input.
 - It's important to put the populations on the same level, and have a systematic model to compare the populations. Then the populations that are going to be essential to the recovery of the MPG and the Distinct Population Segment (DPS) could be identified.
- The workplan is proposed to be in stages, so products can be delivered back to the Recovery Team as they are completed.
- This work could feed into the viability analysis of Open Standards.
- To incorporate climate change information, it would require some level of GIS data for the model. The University of Washington's Climate Impacts group could be a partner on this effort.
- Abundance and productivity are cornerstones of the modeling approach, and the challenge would be to identify core areas that should be protected for long-term existence of the MPG and DPS as a whole. Spatial structure could be important, if the Recovery Team identified that as an area of consideration.
- The Recovery Team discussed the proposed workplan timetable, and points included:
 - The hope was to have modeling results by the end of 2015, but additional time in 2016 is expected to communicate the results to a wider audience.
 - Several members noted that reaching out to field biologists in November-December 2014 is an ambitious timeline. Collecting available data could also take more than two months, though it was noted that this could overlap with NOAA's request for information for the 5-year status update.
- The budget for this work is estimated at roughly \$400,000, which is funded through NOAA's Phase III funds.

Next Steps

- The Recovery Team discussed the advantages and disadvantages of the EDT model versus the life cycle model. To keep momentum and not lose some funding through NOAA (that would disappear by the end of the federal fiscal year on September 30), the Recovery Team agreed to have the subgroup go ahead and solicit a post-doctoral student to start the modeling work. In the meantime, the subgroup could discuss whether a hybrid approach (some life cycle, some EDT) could work, which will be discussed at the next Recovery Team meeting.
 - There is also an opportunity for additional funding, which the Puget Sound Partnership put into their legislative budget request, though that still has to be approved by the Governor's office and then by the legislature.
- Elizabeth Babcock and Alison Agness agreed to follow up with the Recovery Team shortly.

Attendees

Participant	Affiliation
Alison Agness	NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service
Joe Anderson	Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife
Elizabeth Babcock	NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service
Ned Currence	Nooksack Tribe
Ken Currens	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Jeanette Dorner	Puget Sound Partnership
Chris Ellings	Nisqually Tribe
Jeff Hard	Northwest Fisheries Science Center of NOAA Fisheries
Neala Kendall	Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife
Steve Leider	NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service
Randy McIntosh	NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service
Susan O'Neil	Long Live the Kings
Scott Powell	Seattle City Light
David Troutt	Nisqually Tribe
Tim Tynan	NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service
Claire Turpel	Triangle Associates, Inc.